



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/055,242	01/23/2002	Hong Thi Nguyen	BELL-0162/01329	8363
38952	7590	12/28/2004	EXAMINER	
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP ONE LIBERTY PLACE - 46TH FLOOR PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			AL AUBAIDI, RASHA S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2642	

DATE MAILED: 12/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/055,242

Applicant(s)

NGUYEN ET AL.

Examiner

Rasha S AL-Aubaidi

Art Unit

2642

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 September 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Amendment

Specification

1. The abstract of the disclosure, which was submitted with the amendment filed on 09/03/2003, does not commence on a separate sheet in accordance with 37 CFR 1.52(b)(4). A new abstract of the disclosure is required and must be presented on a separate sheet, apart from any other text.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Regarding claims 1, 9 and 14, on page 10 of the new amendment filed 09/03/2004, line 13, claim 1 recites the negative limitation "disconnecting the call without user response from the first telephone station and without response from the second telephone station". This limitation is not supported by the specification that was originally filed by the applicant. However, the only limitation the

Art Unit: 2642

examiner was able to find, which may have similar interpretation was recited on page 11, lines 29-30, and page 12, lines 1-2. This limitation recited the following "SN 109 answers the call, and plays an announcement to the calling party, asking for his/her permission to present his/her number (and name) to the privacy screening subscriber. If the calling party refuses to grant permission to present his/her number (and name) to the subscriber, the call is disconnected". Claims 9 and 14 have the same defect.

Dependent claims 2-8, 10-13, and 15-19 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1, 9, and 14.

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 14, the claim's language is confusing because it implies that all calls from the first telephone station to the second telephone station will be disconnected regardless of the caller on the first telephone station blocking or not blocking their identity. That is, the invention as understood by the examiner,

Art Unit: 2642

works only when the caller on the first telephone chooses to block their identity (i.e., make a "private call").

Depended claims 15-19 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 14.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Stevens et al.

Regarding claim 1, Stevens teaches a method for detecting a call made to a telephone station associated with a privacy screening service (see abstract) routed from a first telephone station (reads on calling party 10, Fig. 1, col. 3, lines 2-3) to a second telephone station (reads on called party 12, Fig. 1, col. 3, lines 2-3) via a switching network, (this reads on either PSTN 14 in Fig. 1 or AIN, see col. 2, lines 54-67) comprising: intercepting a call from a first telephone station (calling party 10) directed to a second telephone station (called party 12); determining if the second telephone (called party 12) station requires identification of the first telephone station for completion of the call (this reads on determining whether this is a desirable call from an authorized list or unwanted call, for example, telemarketer, see col. 2, lines 4-12, also col.3, lines 14-20) ; and in response to determining that the second telephone station (reads on the called party 12) requires identification of the first telephone (calling party 10)

Art Unit: 2642

station for completion of the call, disconnecting the call without user response from the first telephone station and without response from the second telephone station (basically reads on the calling party or the system disconnecting the call, see col. 2, lines 4-7).

Stevens et al does not specifically teach that the caller on "the first telephone station is associated with a subscriber to a caller detection of privacy screening service". That is, in Stevens, the caller (i.e., telemarketer) who is making "annoying" calls (col. 5, lines 55-67) would obviously not want to pay for a call that will be considered "unwanted" by the called party who subscribers to a "privacy screening service". Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to desire to subscribe to a service that would detect that the called party subscribers to the privacy screening feature and then for the calling party (telemarketer) to not want to pay for the call, and, therefore would want that call disconnected.

Claims 9 and 14 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Regarding claims 2 and 15, Stevens teaches intercepting the call from the first telephone station (calling party 10) to the second telephone station (called party 12) based on an indicator associated with the first telephone station (the indicator reads on setting up a flagged in the case of receiving call from calling

Art Unit: 2642

part 10 to the subscriber of the screening service, which is the called party 12, see col. 3, lines 2-13).

Regarding claims 3 and 16, Stevens teaches allowing the call to proceed if the directory number (reads on phone system number (PSN) is included in a list associated with the first telephone station (basically if the PSN of the calling party 10 is within authorized numbers in the database, the call will be connected to the called party 12, see col. 3, lines 13- 20).

Regarding claims 4 and 17, Stevens teaches in response to determining that the second telephone (called party 12) station does not require identification of the first telephone station, completing the call (this reads on the scenario of completing the call in standard manner in the event of an authorized callers).

Regarding claims 5 and 18, Stevens teaches sending an indicator (this reads on SRP 20 sends an instruction to billing office 22, see col. 3, lines 36-40 and Fig. 1) to a billing system to identify a call sent from the first telephone station (the calling party 10) to the second telephone station (the called party 12) wherein the second telephone station requires the identification of the first telephone station for completion of the call.

Regarding claim 6, Stevens teaches in an Advanced Intelligent Network (AIN, see col. 2, lines 56-60) having a service switching point (reads on SSP 16

Art Unit: 2642

in Fig. 1 and col. 2, lines 56-59) and a service control point (SCP 18, Fig. 1), wherein said service switching point hosts an off-hook delay trigger (reads on TDP see col. 2, lines 60-63) associated with the first telephone station (calling party 10), and wherein said intercepting act comprises: actuating said off-hook delay trigger (this is inherent); and querying the service control point to obtain information associated with the second telephone station from a database stored at the services control point (see col. 2, lines 2-10).

Regarding claims 7-8, Stevens teaches in response to determining that the information associated with the second telephone station indicates that identifying information must be supplied by a calling party to the second telephone station before the call can be completed, disconnecting the call (this basically reads on either completing the call in or terminating the call at step 40, see col. 3, lines 6-36).

Regarding claims 10-11, Stevens teaches the AIN comprising a services node (this reads on IVP interactive voice prompting, see col. 2, lines 64-65), the services node including: a voice synthesizer, which generates an audible message (see col. 3, lines 25-32).

Regarding claim 12, Stevens teaches in the AIN the service control point (18) generates a message and sends the message to the service switching point

Art Unit: 2642

(SSP 16) for inclusion on a billing record created by the services switching point and sent to a billing system (see col. 2, lines 56-67 and col. 3, lines 36-49).

Regarding claims 13 and 19, Stevens teaches intercepting the call from the first telephone station to the second telephone station based on actuation of a trigger type event (this read on TDPs "Trigger Detection Points", see col. 2, lines 60-63).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory

Art Unit: 2642

period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rasha S AL-Aubaidi whose telephone number is (703) 605-5145. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad F Matar, can be reached on 305-4731. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 2642

Examiner

Rasha S. Al-Aubaidi

12/13/2004


AHMAD MATAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600